

## REMARKS

Claim 1-20 are pending in the application. In the Office Action of September 30, 2003, the Examiner made the following disposition:

- A.) Objected to claims 6-7, 12-14 and 19-20.
- B.) Rejected claims 1-5, 8-12 and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by *Chang et al. (Pub. No. US 2002/0062406)*.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and address the Examiner's disposition below.

A.) Objection to claims 6-7, 12-14 and 19-20:

Applicants respectfully acknowledge the Examiner's finding of allowable subject matter in claims 6-7, 12-14 and 19-20.

As discussed below, independent claims 1, 8 and 15 are allowable. Claims 6, 7, 12, 14, 19 and 20 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 8 or 15 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 8 and 15 are allowable.

Claims 6, 7, 14 and 20 have been amended to correct informalities.

Applicants respectfully submit the objection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

B.) Rejection of claims 1-5, 8-12 and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by *Chang et al. (Pub. No. US 2002/0062406)*:

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Claim 4 has been amended to correct informalities.

Applicants' independent claims 1, 8 and 15 each claim determining whether rendering information for font data to be transmitted to an output device is resident on the output device. If the rendering information for the font data to be transmitted is not resident on the output device, rendering information for the font data to be transmitted is transmitted to the output device.

As described in Applicants' specification, some conventional methods and systems require additional processing to display an image when font data rendering information is not available on an output device, such as when the output device cannot support an entire font set of Chinese language characters. This conventional additional processing includes converting each page of a document containing non-printer-resident fonts into a large image covering the entire page before sending it to the output device. The output device then prints the page as one image. This conventional approach results in inefficiencies due to the additional image processing step.

(Applicants' specification, page 3, line 26-page 4, line 5).

Applicants' independent claims 1, 8 and 15 overcome these conventional problems by transmitting rendering information for font data to an output device when the rendering information is not resident on the output device. Thus, individual characters having arbitrary fonts are supported and displayed on the output device regardless of whether the specified fonts are loaded or otherwise resident on the output device. (Applicants' specification, page 6, lines 20-24). Unlike conventional methods and systems, additional processing is not required to convert each page of a document containing non-printer-resident fonts into a large image covering the entire page before sending it to the output device. Instead, individual characters from non-printer-resident fonts can be displayed.

This is clearly unlike *Chang*, which fails to disclose or even suggest transmitting to an output device rendering information for font data that is to be transmitted to the output device, if the rendering information for the font data to be transmitted is not resident on the output device. Similar to the conventional methods and systems described in Applicants' specification, *Chang* discloses converting a digital document into an output device specific format. Referring to *Chang* Figure 1, *Chang* discloses an information apparatus 100 that can transmit digital documents to an output device 106 for display. To prevent a situation in which the full content of a digital document is not displayed (*i.e.*, the document is clipped or altered), a client application 102 coordinates conversion of the document into a format that can be displayed, prior to sending the document data to the output device. ([0080], [0081], [0092]).

*Chang* teaches converting the document format, language, or instructions into a format compatible with the output device. ([0092]). Some examples of document conversions taught by *Chang* include: opening, parsing, or interpreting the digital document format or language ([0239]); converting the digital document into an intermediate format, language or data ([0240]); processing the digital document into a raster format ([0241]); and converting or encoding rasterized data into a device specific output data [0242]). As clearly taught by *Chang*, all of *Chang's* disclosed conversions are performed on the document itself prior to the document being transmitted to the output device 106. ([0080], [0081], [0189], [0235], [0238], [0243], [0255]).

Therefore, unlike Applicants' claims 1, 8 and 15 that each claim transmitting rendering information for font data that is to be transmitted to the output device when the rendering information is not resident on the output device, *Chang* merely converts a document itself into a device dependent format prior to transmitting the document to an output device. Thus, *Chang* does not prepare its output device for receiving font data by transmitting rendering information

for the font data, but instead preemptively converts its document to a format suitable for the output device before sending the converted document to the output device.

The Examiner argues that *Chang* discloses transmitting rendering information as claimed in Applicants' claims, however, Applicants respectfully disagree. (See, Office Action of 9/30/2003, Page 3, Paragraph 1). *Chang* mentions the term "font" once in Paragraph [0080], merely stating that a font may be altered or clipped when sent to an output device. Nowhere does *Chang* even mention transmitting rendering information for font data to be transmitted, if the rendering information for the font data to be transmitted is not resident on the output device.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, *Chang* fails to disclose or even suggest Applicants' claims 1, 8 and 15.

Claims 2-5, 9-12 and 16-18 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 8 or 15 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 8 and 15 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claim 1-20 are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

*Christopher P. Rauch* (Reg. No. 45,034)  
Christopher P. Rauch  
SONNENSCHNEIDER, NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box #061080  
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower  
Chicago, IL 60606-1080  
Telephone 312/876-2606  
Customer #26263  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)